

Reply-To: bu.edu!INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL
Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #956
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Fri, 1 Dec 89 Volume 89 : Issue 956

Today's Topics:

ARRL DX NR 48
CRRL BULLETIN 33
ECPA (was: Military aircraft callsi
IC-2400 dual-bander
Mods for Bearcat 760XLT
My backyard, your backyard ...
RS Discone? Good or Bad?
Wall Street Journal on cordless pho

Date: 1 Dec 89 04:13:46 GMT
From: n8emr!gws@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Gary Sanders)
Subject: ARRL DX NR 48
Message-ID: <1368@n8emr.UUCP>

| Relayed from packet radio via |
| N8EMR's Ham BBS, 614-457-4227 (1200/2400/19.2 telebit,8N1) |

ARRL DX NR 48 (ARLD048) 12/1/89

THANKS TO W9NUF AND THE NORTHERN ILLINOIS DX ASSOCIATION FOR THE FOLLOWING DX INFORMATION.

BURKINA FASO. LLOYD AND IRIS COLVIN ARE NOW ACTIVE AS XT2KG. IRIS WAS WORKED ON 14224 KHZ AT 0300Z LAST NIGHT. QSL VIA THE YASME ADDRESS IN THE CALLBOOK.

LAOS. THE XW8CW AND XW8DX OPERATION SHOULD BEGIN IN THE NEXT DAY OR SO. THEY PLAN TO BE ACTIVE FOR FIVE DAYS, THEN TO SPRATLEY ISLAND FOR FIVE DAYS PRIOR TO FIVE MORE DAYS FROM LAOS. JA1UT AND SEVERAL OTHER JA OPERATORS WILL OPERATE FROM THE XW8KPL CLUB STATION LATER THIS MONTH FOR TWO WEEKS. XW8KPL WAS ON 21265 KHZ THIS MORNING AT 1300Z.

NIGER. THE 5U7QL OPERATION BY THE COLVINS ENDED TWO DAYS AGO. QSLs GO VIA YASME. ALAIN, 5U7NU, IS NOW ACTIVE. HIS QSLs GO TO F6FNU.

REVILLA GIGEDO. THE XF4T OPERATION SHOULD CONCLUDE ON DECEMBER 3.

THAILAND. JOHN, K9EL, PLANS A FIVE DAY OPERATION STARTING DECEMBER 7 USING THE CALL HS0E. HE WILL OPERATE MOSTLY CW AND PLANS TO BE ACTIVE ON 40 AND 80 METERS. HE WILL OPERATE /VS6 AFTER THE HS OPERATION. QSL TO THE K9EL CALLBOOK ADDRESS OR VIA THE BUREAU.

TUVALU. RON, ZL1AM0, IS CURRENTLY ACTIVE AS T28RW. WATCH 7005, 14010 AND 14025 KHZ. QSL DIRECT ONLY TO ZH1AM.

YEMEN. UA20 AND THREE OTHER USSR HAMS ARE RUMORED TO BE PLANNING AN OPERATION FROM YEMEN BEGINNING IN THE NEXT FEW DAYS.

SIX METER REPORT. SIX METER DX HAS BEEN EXCEPTIONAL DURING THE PAST THREE WEEKS. YESTERDAY JAS WERE WORKED FROM NORTHERN ILLINOIS FROM 2200 TO 2300Z AND HL9TG AND JH1LDK/JD1 WERE REPORTED. WORKED IN RECENT DAYS HAVE BEEN PA0HAP 50149 KHZ AT 1530Z, CT3CQ 50091 AT 1700, AH6AP/KL7 50109 AT 2055 AND NL7NW 50120 AT 2105.

DXAC NOTES. ON NOVEMBER 15, THE DX ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED THAT BANABA ISLAND, T33, AND CONWAY REEF, 3D, BE ADDED TO THE DXCC COUNTRIES LIST. AT THE SAME TIME, THE DXAC VOTED AGAINST ADDING FREDERICK REEF, THE AUSHRAL ISLANDS AND THE MARQUESAS ISLANDS TO THE LIST.

STATIONS WORKED FROM NORTHERN ILLINOIS DURING THE PAST WEEK INCLUDE,

A44BC	7005/0600	
AP2AF	14200/1500	
D44BC	28037/1530	
EA8AGD	1835/0620	
EL2FL	7000/2145	
FR4ZD	7005/2100	
J6DX	1830/0615	
P29PL	28016/2345	QSL VIA VK9NS
PY1DFF/PY0F	28025/1715	
SU1RR	21035/1530	
TL8CM	21054/2330	
V47QQ	1825/0330 AND 3793/0300	QSL VIA W9QQ
XF4T	14187/0300	
ZD8VJ	14024/2305	
ZK1TB	28035/2100	QSL VIA W7TB
5W1HK	28011/2135	
8P9HT	1850/0600	
9Q5DX	AR	

--

Gary W. Sanders (gws@n8emr or ...!osu-cis!n8emr!gws), 72277,1325
N8EMR @ W8CQK (ip addr) 44.70.0.1 [Ohio AMPR address coordinator]
HAM/SWL/SCANNER BBS (1200/2400/PEP) 614-457-4227
Voice: 614-457-4595 (eves/weekends)

Date: 1 Dec 89 04:15:50 GMT
From: n8emr!gws@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Gary Sanders)
Subject: CRRL BULLETIN 33
Message-ID: <1369@n8emr.UUCP>

=====
| Relayed from packet radio via |
| N8EMR's Ham BBS, 614-457-4227 (1200/2400/19.2 telebit,8N1) |
=====

CRRL BULLETIN 33 ARLC033
NOVEMBER 30, 1989

ACCORDING TO A LETTER WRITTEN BY THE ONTARIO CULTURE AND
COMMUNICATIONS MINISTER, THE ONTARIO GOVERNMENT IS NOT INTERESTED IN
THE 220-225 MHZ AMATEUR BAND. NEWS ITEMS IN THE AMATEUR RADIO
MEDIA, BASED ON ONTARIOS RESPONSE TO A DOC 30-890 MHZ SPECTRUM
PLANNING PAPER, INDICATED THAT A TAKEOVER MIGHT BE COMING.

THE NEW ADDRESS FOR THE CRRL OUTGOING QSL BUREAU IS BOX 56, ARVA,
ONTARIO N0M 1C0. THE INCOMING BUREAU REMAINS AT BOX 51, ST. JOHN,
NEW BRUNSWICK E2L 3X1.

--

Gary W. Sanders (gws@n8emr or ...!osu-cis!n8emr!gws), 72277,1325
N8EMR @ W8CQK (ip addr) 44.70.0.1 [Ohio AMPR address coordinator]
HAM/SWL/SCANNER BBS (1200/2400/PEP) 614-457-4227
Voice: 614-457-4595 (eves/weekends)

Date: 1 Dec 89 01:27:33 GMT
From: unmvax!deimos.cis.ksu.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
phil@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU
Subject: ECPA (was: Military aircraft callsi
Message-ID: <30500311@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> If you want some interesting reading sometime, read the Part 15 rules about
> things like portable phones and baby monitors (and garage door openers, and
> the new RF remote light controllers from X10 and, and....). Basically,
> it says that the device "must accept" interference from any and all other
> sources, and that if a part 15 device is interfering with another
> device, it's the part 15 device's problem.
>

> However, I do happen to know a guy who's fairly high up in the McCaw
> organization (he's in a class I'm attending), and if I see him again,

> I'll probably just mention it in passing.

I think the ECPA referred to cellular communications by service, rather than by frequency, so listening to their cross products, harmonics, etc., could TECHNICALLY be just as illegal as the fundamental. Oh how the lawyers would love to continue hassling you so they can "prove" to their customers that they are "fighting" for their privacy. I wonder what laws (this is more along the lines of misc.legal) could protect you if someone ELSE's stupidity and incompetence (the manufacturer of the part 15 device) caused you to be in violation of ECPA.

Also consider, what if the device was on 900 Mhz and so was my repeater which is on the same tower, and what if it was trashing your part 15 device because the frequency was nearly the same.

It may or may not have been the fault of the cellular company, maybe their engineers are or are not competent, but their lawyer was definitely an asshole.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 30 Nov 89 15:38:09 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!samsung!shadooby!sharkey!cfctech!teemc!mibte!
gamma!thumper!hwd@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Harold Winard)
Subject: IC-2400 dual-bander
Message-ID: <1780@thumper.bellcore.com>

Does anyone have any opinions about the new ICOM IC-2400 dual-band transceiver? I'm looking for comments pro or con about the performance of the rig. I'd also like to know if anyone has information on extending the rig's receive range up to 460 or 470 MHz.

Thanks and 73,

Harold
KB2M
hwd@pyuxz.bellcore.com

Date: 1 Dec 89 01:26:39 GMT
From: pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!usc!polyslo!
gjunell@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Gregorio Cortez)
Subject: Mods for Bearcat 760XLT

Message-ID: <1989Dec1.012639.23594@polyslo.CalPoly.EDU>

Does anyone have mods to restore the frequency coverage between 823-849MHz and 868-894MHz on the Uniden Bearcat BC-760XLT (also marketed as the Bearcat BC-950XLT by Scanner World)? This looks like a great mobile, I'd also like to hear from those who own one.

Reply via email, please. I will post summary if requested.

-Kirk

```
--
><>      . .      ><><>< (smooch!)      . .      ><>
      . ><>      . .      <><
<><      . .      ><>      ..      <>< <><
      ><> .      <><      .      ><>
```

Date: 1 Dec 89 02:10:41 GMT
From: unsvox!arrakis.nevada.edu!storkus@uunet.uu.net (Mike Storke (N7MSD))
Subject: My backyard, your backyard ...
Message-ID: <1080@unsvox.NEVADA.EDU>

I have a hard time believing that I have to pay for something that comes broadcast - whether I want it or not - through my yard and property. Lets talk about the example of the play in the theater: The people can't be denied entrance on anything except non-payment for services. In other words, the visual presentation, the sound - they are not going out of that theater, and only (under "ideal" conditions) the people inside can hear it.

Now on the other hand, something like hbo (I did that on purpose) says you have to pay for their services to receive it. But if I can receive it whether they say so or not, they shouldn't be able to tell me what to do: Is that not an "invasion of privacy" (a man's home is HIS castle comes to mind...). If they don't want me watching it, they'll encrypt it (which they're smart enough to be doing). But what I do in my property with my land and my things is my business, so long as it doesn't interfere with the pleasure of anyone else (their pleasure of ripping me off excluded). So if they don't do something that either keeps their signal from coming into my home or keep me from decyphering their signal, hey, that's THEIR problem, not mine. I always say an unenforcable law is a bad law, and if their publicly broadcast information enters my home, I can and will intercept it, whether it's my right or not (finders-keepers also comes to mind...).

So my point? Anything publicly broadcast over the airwaves becomes just that: public property. If you don't like it, keep them from receiving it by using wires or encrypt it with a secure key. Because open broadcast is open season on the airwaves, and people WILL intercept it. That's all I have to say, 73's,

Mike P. Storke, N7MSD NOTICE: Use my HOME QTH address until mid January.
Inet: storkus@arrakis.nevada.edu Packet: KF7TI @ LAS:K7WS-1 or VEGAS:P0T0SI
Snailmail: Box 6 Minden, Nv 89423:HOME QTH. And I claim EVERYTHING I SAY!!
"Pascal: The Handcuff of the programmer. I WANT MY C!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!"

Date: 30 Nov 89 22:56:02 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!usc!sdsu!crash!pnet01!scotto@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Scott O'Connell)
Subject: RS Discone? Good or Bad?
Message-ID: <803@crash.cts.com>

Every time this question pops up I find out something else about the RS discone. I have the ICOM discone. I bought it because someone said it had better performance even though it was identical to the RS discone. Well, here's what I've found out after reading several months of questions/answers:

The RS discone is cheaper, has a SO-239 connector, has HOLLOW aluminum cone elements, AND, no low-band whip.

The ICOM discone is about \$30 more, has an N-type connector, has SOLID stainless steel elements, AND, a low-band whip.

So, they're not identical.

I hope this is more complete information than has been posted in the past. Oh, also, the ICOM comes with 50' of cable and N connectors. Maybe with all these little extras the ICOM is actually a good deal?

Date: 1 Dec 89 01:27:37 GMT
From: unmvax!deimos.cis.ksu.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU
Subject: Wall Street Journal on cordless pho
Message-ID: <30500312@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> NO PRIVACY -- "...Since the early 1980s, the courts have ruled in
> at least a half-dozen cases that private citizens talking on
> cordless phones don't have a reasonable expectation of privacy and
> therefore aren't covered by the Fourth Amendment. ... Both the
> courts and Congress have reasoned that radio technology used in
> cordless phones makes the calls easy to intercept, whether
> inadvertently or not. So, legal protections would be difficult to

> enforce. ... Lawyers say the courts haven't yet directly
> considered the rights of the person on the other end of a
> cordless telephone conversation ... but judges have indicated that
> if someone using a conventional phone knows the other party to the
> call is using a cordless phone, neither end of the discussion will
> be protected."

And they have not considered cellular yet, which basically requires barely
more technology (a TV set will do) to receive. So I wonder if a case can
be built on this to throw ECPA out.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #956
